

LABOR POWER

Official Organ of the Socialist Union Party

ONLY SOCIALISM CAN DESTROY FASCISM

VOLUME 2

JANUARY, 1941

NUMBER 7

Roosevelt Declares War

U. S. Imperialism in the Far East

Socialism and Peace

Organized Labor and National Defense

Published by the Socialist Union Party,
140 Fourth Avenue, Brooklyn, New York.

PRICE 5 CENTS

U. S. Imperialism in the Far East

The economic background of the simmering Far Eastern crisis in the relations between British-American interests and Japanese imperialism was dramatically epitomized by a brief exchange between Japanese Foreign Minister Yosuke Matsuoka and American Ambassador Joseph C. Grew at a banquet given by the Japan-American Society at Tokio in December.

The Foreign Minister had remarked in the course of his address that "After all, the fate of China is largely a matter of sentiment to Americans, but to us it is a vital issue."

Ambassador Grew, who immediately followed Matsuoka, vigorously repudiated this interpretation. "I think I must relieve the Foreign Minister of his misapprehension that the interests of the American people in China are largely sentimental," he stated.

This blunt and open avowal that American imperialism's interest in the Chinese struggle is based primarily on economic and material considerations was immediately confirmed by Secretary of State Hull in Washington, who informed the press that the American policy of insisting on the restoration of the status quo in China and the Far East still stands. This means that the United States still upholds the famous "Open Door" declaration for China which was formulated back in 1899 by Secretary of State John Hay. The "Open Door" policy calls for equal opportunities for all nations to trade with China and to participate in its economic exploitation and development.

CHINA — IMPERIALISM'S EL DORADO

The "Open Door" policy reflects the realization that the Far East contains untapped natural resources and potential markets too valuable to be lightly dropped into some competitor nations' laps. Some idea of the infinite riches of the stakes that are being contended for between the rival camps of the British-American and Japanese imperialism may be gained from a study made by Robert Aura Smith and recently published under the title "Our Future in Asia." Mr. Smith is an authority on the Far Eastern question from the bourgeois point of view, having spent 20

years in the Orient as a newspaper correspondent. He has acquired unequalled first-hand sources of information. His book lights up the dark recesses and the murky background of the present crisis as with a giant searchlight.

Despite the fact that Mr. Smith is an open, vigorous and unabashed champion of American imperialism, "Our Future in Asia" cannot be recommended too highly to all who are interested in acquiring a truthful picture of the forces motivating the actions of American imperialism in the Far East. Mr. Smith does not permit his open sympathies for imperialist exploitation to interfere with his bald presentation of the facts. Let us see the stakes for which America is fighting in China:

"We have become conscious in the last few years of these four hundred million [Chinese] customers. The possibilities of China's economic future, however, stagger the wildest imaginations. In no other country in the world is so great a potential wealth so little developed. . . .

"The utilization of this wealth means one thing above all else; it means a change in the standard of living of 450,000,000 Chinese. That in turn, means the increasing demand for processed goods to supply those rising needs.

"This need for processed goods will be met in two ways. The first is by direct importation of the goods themselves. The second is by providing the means by which an increasingly large part of those goods will be fabricated in China itself. In both cases, or in either, there will be a gigantic need for outside materials, outside money and outside skills.

"The development of this producing wealth, moreover, embraces huge enterprises in construction. The most obvious of course is the building of highways. It is hard to realize that in all of China—in an area the size of all of continental United States there are not as many miles of paved road as there are in the State of New Jersey.

"Some day these roads will be built . . . There will be, not miles of roads . . . but there will be literally millions of miles of road from

(Continued on Page 9)

LABOR POWER

Published Monthly by the
SOCIALIST UNION PARTY

140 Fourth Ave.
BROOKLYN, N.Y.

Subscription: — Per Year, 50c; Semi-Annually, 25c; Single Copy, 5c.

Composed & Printed by Voluntary Labor

Vol. 2, No. 7

January, 1941

Editorials . . .

ROOSEVELT DECLARES WAR

The President's December 29th "Fireside Chat" has been hailed in capitalist circles as a historical landmark in the annals of American foreign policy. The usually stolid *New York Times* lauds the address in the highest terms:

"The President's address of Sunday night will take its place among the historic state papers of this nation not because it proposed a sudden departure from a previously established policy but because with extraordinary eloquence and deep sincerity it affirmed a doctrine intrinsically as old as the republic. That doctrine is our determination not to permit control of the seaways leading to our coasts to pass into hands of a power hostile to our own democratic way of life and bent on its destruction."

This a point which the capitalist press as a whole did not see fit to emphasize. Nevertheless it is the nub of the entire address and the key to the foreign policy of American imperialism.

THE REAL MEANING

What the *New York Times* is here telling us in plain language is that all the high idealism of the President's address, and the "sacred crusade" against Hitlerism, the enemy of civilization which Great Britain and its ally the United States are waging resolve themselves simply into this: American imperialism cannot and will not tolerate hostile control of the international seaways. The world seaways both on the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans

including the South China Seas which imperialist Japan is now attempting to gobble up, are indispensable life lines of American imperialism. The control of these lifelines by hostile imperialist powers would be fatal. American imperialism proposes to fight, and to fight to the bitter end, to forestall such a calamity. This is the real, unvarnished purport of the President's address.

It would be a very poor service to the interests of American imperialism to come out plain and blunt with this basic and incontestible truth. Accordingly the *Times* casts this irreconcilable conflict between American imperialism and the Axis imperialism in the garb of an ideological conflict between Democracy and Fascism. There is no more truth in this contention than there is in Hitler's counter claim that the war he is waging upon behalf of German imperialism to bring the entire world under the heel of Nazi slavery is a war for the emancipation of the workers of the world from the slavery of the ruling capitalist nations. Both camps employ the language of idealism to mask the substance of their imperialist aspirations and conflicts.

FAKE "FREEDOM OF THE SEAS"

To further the illusion of a democratic war against predatory fascism, the *Times* attempts to confuse the vital necessity of American imperialism's control of the world seaways with the traditional American policy of "Freedom of the Seas." The two are entirely different and separate propositions. The doctrine of the "Freedom of the Seas" involved the right of American ships to ply the seven seas without interference. This doctrine had nothing to do with the control of the world seaways. During the 19th century the control of the "seaways leading to our coasts" was actually in the hands of a "hostile" power—Great Britain. (If the *Times* insists that England was a friendly democratic power, then let it explain why early in the century it forced America into war, and during the Civil War it outfitted Confederate sea raiders to prey on Union commerce.)

Nevertheless the *Times* scores a valid point. The President's address is epoch-making and marks a new chapter in American foreign policy. For it constitutes the first official recognition of American imperialism's necessity to control the world seaways leading to

its shores and its determination at all costs to prevent this control from falling into the hands of hostile imperialists. And it would make no difference whether or not the Axis rivals of American imperialism subscribe to democratic forms as do Great Britain and the United States; the rivalry between the two camps springing from an irreconcilable economic basis would still be implacable, and hostile control of seaways equally fatal.

* * *

The President's address constitutes an open declaration of war against the Axis powers and is thus interpreted by diplomatic sources throughout the world. To be sure this is not according to the usages of International Law. But at long last British and American imperialism have realized that the conflict with Nazi imperialism cannot be carried on according to the precepts of International Law, a law which Hitler has flouted from the very first for the advancement of his own imperialist ambitions.

U. S. AT NO TIME NEUTRAL

The President's address gives official recognition to what has become an accomplished fact.

For all practical purposes, certainly since the destroyer deal, America is at war. From the very beginning of the war, American imperialism was under no illusions as to its real character and its own life-and-death interest in its outcome. At the very beginning it could not come openly to the assistance of Great Britain, as the anti-war sentiment of the masses was far too strong. Nevertheless the Roosevelt Administration was not neutral and pulled every diplomatic string at its disposal to assist Great Britain. It was not until the collapse of France and the imminent collapse of Britain had created a state of panic among the American people, and sharply pointed the consequences of a Nazi victory, that the Administration was able to come open-

ly to the assistance of Great Britain.

The Roosevelt Administration with the whole-hearted assistance of the American Capitalist class skillfully manipulated the Hitler triumphs to create a war hysteria in the United States. Today the majority of the American people are strongly committed to a policy of "all aid to Great Britain short of war." But while desperately eager for the defeat of Hitler the American masses are still clinging to the forlorn hope that actual war and the sending of armed forces can be avoided.

THE ILLUSION OF PEACE

It is because of this reluctance on the part of the masses that the President still found himself under the necessity of maintaining the fiction that all-out aid to Great Britain still constituted peace, since it did not involve sending an American expeditionary force outside of American borders. The President took occasion to reaffirm his solemn pledge that there was no intention of sending such an expeditionary force outside of the borders of the United States. The President could with good grace make this pledge since Great Britain at this time has no need for an American expeditionary force. Her needs are for bombers, military supplies and ships. With an ample supply of these she could lift the siege against her Island Kingdom and carry the war into Germany.

Let there be no false illusions. There is no peace and there can be no peace. American imperialism having taken the step of openly declaring war against the Axis powers, it can no longer go back. Should the need arise for our armed forces in Europe, this need will be supplied. To follow any other course would be to invite disaster and American imperialism does not intend to commit suicide.

Above all let the American workers remember that only Socialism—the Social-Revolution—can destroy the slavery of Fascism.

Organized Labor and National Defense

As United States imperialism accelerates its preparations for more direct participation in the struggle for world mastery, link by link the chains are being forged for total regimen-

tation of the working class. Confronted by this unprecedented threat to its very existence, the labor movement is exhibiting a tragic blindness to the meaning of "national de-

fense." Without raising a finger, voluntarily, labor is submitting to the cries for more and more sacrifices which have as their end the transformation of the working class into the helpless pawn of imperialism.

A. F. OF L. CAPITULATES

With apparent backing from the rank and file, high officials of both the A. F. of L. and C. I. O. have come out with statements and proposals in which they vie with each other and with the capitalists themselves in supporting the "defense program" and pledging sacrifices on the part of labor. In a nationwide broadcast, William Green, A. F. of L. President, surrendered the right of labor to strike during the present national 'emergency.' He promised that A. F. of L. affiliates could be depended upon not to strike 'not only for trivial reasons, BUT FOR SCARCELY ANY CAUSE.' The A. F. of L. has gone down the line and has demonstrated its willingness to give up everything to the demands of industry and government, lock, stock and barrel.

A concrete manifestation of the A. F. of L. policy of "defense cooperation" in operation is offered by the action of Green in despatching William C. Flushing, chairman of the legislative committee of the A. F. of L. to Panama, to deal with threatened strikes in the Canal Zone. On his return to New York Mr. Flushing gave assurance, according to the press, that there would be no halt in the "defense" work on the Canal. He was further reported as stating: "There was considerable unrest because the contractors were working the men Sundays and holidays and not paying overtime. I assured the men we would iron out their complaints in Washington and told them they must stay on the job."

Here we see the A. F. of L. officialdom in their traditional role of troubleshooters for capital. The Canal Zone army contractors, whose contracts provide for the contingency of increased labor costs, proceeded to take advantage of the prevailing "defense" hysteria to break down labor standards. To the capitalist press, when the workers dare to insist on standing up for their standards, it constitutes labor sabotage of 'national defense.' Along come the obliging A. F. of L. fakers who join the hue and cry and high pressure the workers back into submission.

C. I. O. AND "DEFENSE"

Unlike the A. F. of L., the C. I. O. has not followed the logic of its support of "defense" to the extent of giving up the right to strike. R. J. Thomas, President of the United Auto Workers Union, has stated the C. I. O. position as follows:

"We most certainly will do everything in our power to cooperate with management and the government in speeding work for 'national defense' but it is impossible for us to give up the right to strike. . . ."

This is not mere verbiage. In the face of a powerful capitalist-generated hysteria against strikes in 'defense' industries, the C. I. O. has persisted with its organizational campaign in the strongly anti-union aviation industry. The Vultee aircraft strike, since followed by the Brewster Aeronautical Corp. settlement, was the opening gun in this campaign and a strenuous effort is being made to organize the rest of the industry.

Superficially it may appear that the C. I. O.'s stand means that the working class will have at least one bulwark against the advance of reaction. Unfortunately such hope is vain. As the statement of Mr. Thomas indicates, the C. I. O. has been no less zealous than the A. F. of L. in tendering labor's support for the "defense" program. Both sets of labor bureaucrats accept the principle that capitalist preparations for an imperialist struggle with foreign rivals are a legitimate concern of the working class so long as they are camouflaged under the slogan of "national defense."

The C. I. O. bureaucrats who are so busily engaged in touting the capitalist "defense" program may honestly believe they can reconcile their policies of preserving the workers' right to organize independently and strike with the needs of "defense." The fact is, however, that the acceptance of one policy eventually must mean the destruction of the other. Once the labor movement accepts the twofold premise that capitalist "national defense" is its legitimate concern and that the ruling class and its government can be trusted to carry on a principled struggle against Hitlerism and Fascism, then it must be prepared to accept the full logic and consequences of this position.

As has been repeatedly pointed out in the columns of LABOR POWER, if it wishes

to compete successfully with its Fascist rivals, democratic capitalism must adopt similar methods. Specifically this means totalitarian rule, with a regimented working class and the imprisonment or execution of those who refuse to surrender their hard-won rights.

THE ROLE OF HILLMAN

Labor cannot play around with the capitalist "defense" program and expect to retain its rights and standards at the same time. The contradiction between the two interests is strikingly portrayed by the spectacle of labor's so-called "representative" on the "Defense" council, Sidney Hillman. In his brief career since the National Defense Advisory Commission was set up, Hillman has permitted the army and navy purchasing officers to violate one after another of the laws supposedly designed to protect the workers in the awarding of contracts, making only faint and half-hearted protests to give the impression that he is looking out for the workers' interests. He has walked backward over the prostrate body of labor, giving way to the exigencies of "national defense."

Yes, Hillman has done his work well. As a labor lieutenant of the employers his function has been to give the working class the illusion that its interests are being taken care of and also that it has a stake in the war preparations program. But even if by mischance he should really attempt to speak up or act for the workers, the very set-up of the "defense" council would defeat any of his efforts. As the Washington correspondents, Alsop and Kintner, explained the matter to their clients when Hillman was appointed by President Roosevelt as associate director with William S. Knudsen of the new four-man super-defense commission: "Some of the more nervous business men in the Defense Commission are disturbed by Mr. Hillman's elevation, but Mr. Knudsen has not much less reason for satisfaction with the four-man council than with the three. It was vitally necessary, in any case, to have an effective labor division of the defense organization, which Mr. Hillman can now proceed to build. *And if Mr. Hillman attempts to use his position to interfere with production problems outside the labor field, or to press labor's desires at the expense of vital production, then he will find himself confronted with a solid front of his*

three colleagues. So long as Mr. Stimson and Col. Knox remain determined that Mr. Knudsen must be boss, he will be."

The role of the "labor representative" can only be to help the capitalists pull the wool over the eyes of the working class.

NOT "DEFENSE" BUT MILITANCY!

Labor must break with the idea that it has any stake in the defense of American imperialist interests. Only when labor is freed from the paralysis induced by the corroding "defense" psychology will it be in a position to wield its unbeatable economic power in its own interests and in the interests of society. The few finance-capitalists who own and control the industries of the nation and hence dominate the government are interested only in the defense of their far-flung imperialist interests. Their talk about the "defense of democracy" and the "crusade against Fascism" are so much eyewash, put forward to cover up the sordid imperialist aims for which they have dragged us into the Second World War in all but name.

The most efficient "defense" of United States imperialism will call for more sacrifices on the part of labor; the best "defense" will call for a regimented working class reduced to the level of coolies. In short the best capitalist defense is Fascism.

The only force genuinely concerned with the preservation and extension of democracy, the emancipation of the working class, and the establishment of lasting peace on earth is the revolutionary Socialist movement. Once the workers take the control of society into their own hands they will wipe Fascism off the face of the earth. To the task of making the workers see this every class conscious militant must apply himself.

But first, the labor movement must be freed from the paralyzing propaganda of "national defense" which would render the workers into helpless pawns of American imperialism.

**Send orders and remittances to the
Business Manager, Labor Power—**

140 Fourth Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y. C.

**DON'T FORGET TO RENEW YOUR
SUBSCRIPTION TO LABOR POWER.**

Socialism and Peace

In recent months insistent demands have been raised in certain quarters, both in Great Britain and in the United States, that steps be taken to obtain a "just" peace by negotiation between the belligerent powers.

In this country a coterie of isolationist Senators, headed by Wheeler and Vandenberg, have made the demand that President Roosevelt use his good offices in launching a move for a negotiated peace. In the British Parliament the Independent Labor Party members introduced, as an amendment to the House of Commons' reply to the King's Address from the throne, a proposal calling for a statement of Britain's war aims and for the convocation of a conference between Great Britain and Germany to bring the war to an early conclusion. This amendment was decisively voted down, with 341 opposed to 4 in favor. Its defeat was widely hailed by the American press as a great "victory" for the forces of Democracy in the struggle against Hitlerism. Among the loudest in condemning any peace moves before Hitler has been defeated were all the social patriots of both Britain and the United States.

IS PEACE POSSIBLE?

The I.L.P.'s proposal serves to bring to the fore the question of the attitude of the Socialist movement toward this and similar "peace" moves in the present imperialist war. The Socialist Union Party, basing its attitude upon irreconcilable opposition to the raging imperialist slaughter, and struggling for a real and lasting peace, must, for those very reasons, reject categorically as a snare and a delusion any moves which hold forth the hope to the working class that peace can be secured without overthrowing the capitalist regimes whose rivalries brought on the war.

Contrary to the idea fostered by certain journalists as a result of the I.L.P. motion, Socialists do not hold that it is necessary to have peace as a move toward Socialism. What we maintain is that no peace is possible without Socialism—exactly the converse! In rejecting the I.L.P.'s attempt to halt the war, we are not motivated by any concern for the fortunes of British imperialism or its United States allies, nor do we accept their dictum that it is first necessary to destroy Hitler

before there can be talk of peace. It is not only Hitler, but Democratic capitalist imperialism as well, which must first be extirpated before there can be an enduring peace! To hold out to the workers the possibility of a "just" and lasting peace without first abolishing capitalism and its class rule, as does the I.L.P., is to falsify the facts, mislead the workers and play the game of the capitalist reaction which is busily engaged in forging the chains of totalitarian slavery for the working class.

NEGOTIATED PEACE—A SHAM

Only Socialism can bring peace. But this does not mean that a negotiated so-called peace is not a distinct possibility. In fact, at this particular stage of the war, nothing could better serve Hitler's purposes. Having thus far failed to knock out Great Britain, and being confronted with a growing and more effective war effort on the part of American imperialism while he must reckon with the military collapse of his Italian partner, Hitler can very well use a period of respite in which to consolidate his forces and patch up his domestic morale. For the moment Britain is sufficiently confident of the efficacy of the United States war assistance measures to spurn a negotiated peace with its deadly rival, but it would take only a few military reverses to alter this attitude.

Even were such a negotiated peace achieved, however, it would be far from a real and permanent peace. It could only be an armed truce, an interlude between battles. It is quite true that while such an armed truce lasted there would be an abatement of the grimmer aspects of modern warfare, such as the aerial bombardment of crowded cities and the deliberate starvation of non-combatants, the burdens of which fall principally on the workers. A capitalist "peace" would bring a temporary halt to these brutalities, *but only at the price of making permanent the totalitarian subjugation of the workers.* The price of such "peace" would be a new capitalist order of "to l, sweat and sacrifice."

THE BASIS OF APPEASEMENT

The drive for a negotiated peace at this time, when it does not arise from confused

pacifist elements, among which must be counted the I.L.P.'s representatives in Parliament, is a continuation in another guise of the discredited policy of appeasement of Hitler which was first associated with the late Prime Minister Chamberlain. The gospel of appeasement flows from the peculiar position in which British imperialism found itself when Nazi Germany re-emerged under Hitler as a formidable rival to challenge Britain's world-wide imperialist domination.

On the one hand the rivalry between British and German imperialism is based on irreconcilable conflicts of interest which can only be settled by force of arms. On the other hand Chamberlain and his clique feared to embark on such a struggle for fear that when it was over, an exhausted and war-torn Europe would give rise to a possible revolution which would tear down the entire structure of international capitalism. To avoid such a "calamity" the Chamberlain government offered Nazi imperialism concession after concession in the vain hope of appeasing its lust for power. When, finally, it dawned upon them that Hitler would be satisfied with nothing less than complete mastery of the earth, the first phase of appeasement was over and war was declared.

But the fact that Churchill, the implacable foe of Nazi imperialism, is now in the saddle and that the I.L.P. peace move was so unceremoniously rejected by the political representatives of British capitalism does not signify that the tactic of appeasement is dead. As long as Hitler's savage assaults are warded off, America continues to supply substantial and growing war aid, and the empire is maintained unimpaired, the forces of British capitulation and appeasement will remain silent or give formal support to the war policies. The moment the picture changes however, so that a Hitler victory appears probable, then these forces will be galvanized into action, and the British ruling class, like its late ally the French ruling class, will hasten to make its peace with Nazi totalitarianism over the prostrate body of the British working class.

THE AMERICAN APPEASERS

The top capitalists in America also have their advocates of appeasement who look upon a victory for Hitler as inevitable. They hold that the aid now being extended by the Roosevelt administration to Great Britain will

seriously compromise the position of American imperialism after Hitler becomes the master of Europe. These gentry maintain that in the new world lineup the interests of American imperialism demand a friendly understanding with Hitler. According to them America has nothing to fear from a Hitler victory and they believe that an honorable agreement can be reached with the Nazis which would protect American interests.

Like their counterparts in Britain, these gentry misuse the worthy aspirations of the American people to peace and democracy for the purpose of playing Hitler's game here in America. They craftily point out that the entrance of the United States into the war means the setting up of a totalitarian regime at home. But they very conveniently suppress the fact that any "satisfactory" arrangement with Hitler can only be affected on the basis of the enslavement of the American working class! The tears that they shed on behalf of peace and democracy are merely crocodile tears. Their main concern is not to achieve these worthy objectives, but to reach a satisfactory agreement with Hitler. Keeping America at peace and crippling U. S. aid to British imperialism is their part of the bargain.

The most prominent and vocal American appeasers have been Colonel Charles Lindbergh, the erstwhile Lone Eagle, and Joseph P. Kennedy, Ex-Ambassador to London. For some time there has been in existence an America First Committee, headed by General Robert Wood, President of Sears, Roebuck & Co., which has carried on an organized campaign for appeasement under the guise of a peace movement. Ernest T. Weir and Henry Ford are among the prominent industrialists who have approved the work of this committee. Their activities, however, have been overshadowed and almost blocked out of public view by the far more aggressive William Allen White Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies. This group has been exceedingly active and successful in whipping up sentiment for extending "all aid short of war" to Great Britain. To counteract the sweeping success of the White Committee in influencing public opinion and administration action, a new appeasement outfit known as the No Foreign War Committee has been hastily organized with Verne Marshall, editor of the

Cedar Rapids Gazette at its head.

NO PEACE WITHOUT SOCIALISM

The Socialist Union Party, despite its unalterable opposition to the present slaughter, has nothing in common with the American agents of Hitler appeasement. The workers must beware of their fake and demagogic campaign to keep America at peace by capitulating to Hitler. At the same time the S.U.P. also denounces the hypocrisy of the British-American Democratic imperialists who profess to be waging a principled struggle against Fascism. Nothing is further from the truth. British imperialism and its American ally are engaged in a life-and-death struggle to preserve their dominant role as the leading world powers and to break the back of their deadly Nazi rival who has dared to challenge this domination.

All talk about fighting Fascism and preserving democracy is so much eyewash when it is mouthed by the supporters of the present imperialist struggle. Already the pattern of a totalitarian regime has been laid down in Great Britain and movements in the same direction have been making rapid strides in the United States under the leadership of the Roosevelt Administration itself. More important than this, a British victory against the Hitler regime can only be won after a long and enervating struggle with both sides exhausted at the end. Already Britain is close to a financial exhaustion.

The close of such a war would find the victorious allies confronted with a Europe in ruins. Decadent capitalism would be in no condition to carry on under the benign forms of democratic rule. To preserve its class power and privileges the British ruling class would be compelled even in the event of victory to convert the so-called temporary wartime totalitarian regime into a permanent dictatorship over the workers. Thus, in helping to destroy the Hitler regime in Germany without coming to grips with their own ruling class, the British workers will have blindly helped to establish a totalitarian regime at home.

The only "peace" that capitalist imperialism can offer to the workers of the world in its last stage of decay and disintegration is the calm and quiet of the concentration camp! The irrepressible rivalries between the various

capitalist nations makes any real peace an impossibility. That is why all talk of "peace" conferences or of the possibility of negotiating a "just" peace under capitalism is so much muddle-headedness when it isn't the sheerest hypocrisy. Those who aid in propagating such nonsense are playing directly into the hands of the workers' enemies.

It is the duty of every class conscious worker to expose uncompromisingly the fake peace panaceas of capitalist imperialism and its witting or unwitting tools. Not "peace" conferences but only the abolition of capitalism can bring a real and lasting peace to suffering humanity.

AMERICAN IMPERIALISM IN THE FAR EAST

(Continued from Page 2)

one end of China to the other. Some one will supply the cement and asphalt for those highways, someone will supply the scrapers and the steam rollers and the concrete mixers and when China is ribboned from top to bottom there will be the inevitable filling stations and someone will supply the pumps and the gasoline that goes with them.

"On those roads will roll millions of cars and there will be four tires to a car. Someone will supply the materials and skill that built those automobiles and those multiplied millions of miles of rubber on which they roll. . .

"Someone will assist in the building of the New China. The future of China and the future of the United States in Asia may very well be determined by whether or not those rubber tires that roll on Chinese roads are made in Akron or Osaka. . ."

A study by Nathaniel Pfeffer, Associate Professor of International Relations at Columbia University, made for the Far-Pacific Institute and published under the title of "Prerequisites to Peace in the Far East" corroborates Mr. Smith's analysis completely, says Professor Pfeffer:

"It is precisely in the industrialization of China that there lies the most promising opportunity for profitable enterprise by foreign countries, an opportunity that no imperialistic domination could yield, an opportunity such as perhaps has never existed heretofore except when the American continent was being developed. Here indeed may be the hope of

escape for at least a period, from the economic impasse in which Western industrialized countries have been caught for more than a decade. For China to be developed industrially it will need credit, it will need capital goods. There will be thousands of miles of railways to be built, mines to be opened, harbors to be dug and equipped, public utilities to be established, factories of all kinds to be furnished with machinery. The banks and workshops of the world can be profitably occupied for decades if China is unimpeded in industrialization."

RAW MATERIALS OF WAR

Here we have stated in simple terms the real motivating force behind the American policy of the "Open Door." But American and British imperialism have an even more vital stake in the Far East. This important region is their chief source of supply for indispensable raw materials, the loss of which would seriously disrupt their economic pattern of life. Once more we are indebted to Mr. Smith's book for a vivid picture of the role that these strategic raw materials play in the drama of the Far East.

"On a map of Eastern Asia set a pair of compasses, one leg in the center of the South China Sea, the other extended to the scale of 1,000 miles and draw the circle. Enclosed in this circle is the battleground of America's future in Asia. Within this circle are the three most southerly provinces of China, Indo-China, the Philippines, most of Netherlands India, British Malaya, Thailand and part of Burma . . . This is the world's storehouse, a producer of raw materials beyond comparison. Our relation to this storehouse and our access to it must necessarily determine our future in Asia."

"Any drastic modification of our pre-war economic and political structures in the area of the South China Sea is a matter of vital concern to the United States both of strategy and profit. For both necessities and comforts we are dependent to a greater degree than is often realized upon our continued access to the area of the South China Sea."

Space limitations prevent us from following Mr. Smith further as he charts the relation of raw materials from the Far East to American needs. Before we leave this ex-

cellent source book, however, we present a few of Mr. Smith's political conclusions as examples of what the American imperialists are thinking about.

U. S. IMPERIALIST LIFE LINE

"In short, our political position is a very important chip in the economic poker game. It enables us to deal with problems of supply and demand on the basis of agreement and not on the basis of surrender to some one else's monopoly. This is true not only of production but of commerce as well. Any hostile control of the South China Sea would dominate some of Asia's major ship lanes. The South China Sea is not only the outlet for the countries that surround it. It is a highway of world trade. . . .

"It requires no stretch of the imagination to see what would happen to these routes of international commerce if the South China Sea were turned into a Japanese lake. What is at present a position of immense political and economic strength to the whole Western World would be turned immediately into a position of tragic commercial weakness by the withdrawal of the United States."

That the danger depicted by Mr. Smith is very real and immediate for American capitalism is confirmed by a recent dispatch from Rome to the *New York Herald Tribune* (Dec. 28th), which quotes a Tokio cable to *Il Popolo di Roma* to the effect that Japan's major military objectives were no longer in Northern China but in Singapore, Manila and Hongkong. In other words, Japan is now reaching out to grasp the source of supply of American-British imperialism's raw materials for war.

The after-dinner exchange between the Japanese Foreign Minister and Ambassador Grew in Tokio is merely the latest episode in the larger struggle for imperialist domination of the continent of Asia and its surrounding waters. This conflict has now reached a crisis which threatens at any moment to boil over into armed conflict between the contending rivals.

The climax of this crisis came with the announcement of the Three Power Axis pact between Japan, Germany and Italy. While this was not exactly unexpected, its actual conclusion caused a tremendous sensation in the United States and Great Britain. The

pact was directly aimed at the United States since under its terms if the United States enters the war against Germany it would automatically be confronted with a two-ocean conflict, with Japan moving against it in the Pacific.

In Tokio the press and spokesmen for the government laid Japan's entry into the Axis camp to the "unfriendly" act of both Great Britain and the United States. Foreign Minister Matsuoka, addressing a special conference of prefectural governors, bluntly accused the two countries of attempting "to disturb the peace of the Far East by prolonging the Chinese-Japanese conflict through the extension of assistance to the Chiang Kai-Shek regime." He went on to cite the whole course of American anti-Japanese policies going back to the refusal of the American government to recognize the Japanese puppet regime in Manchuria and coming down to the recent renunciation of the 1911 Trade Treaty and the whole series of discriminatory embargoes of essential military supplies which the American government is now enforcing against Japan. Particularly resented were the war loans extended to the Chinese government by America.

The reaction of Britain and America to the conclusion of the Axis agreement was to stiffen their opposition to Japanese moves. Britain went through with its announced plan to reopen the Burma Road into China which it had previously closed under pressure from Japan as an aftermath of the fall of France. This move was a signal victory for the Chinese, who are dependent upon its accessibility for the transportation of indispensable war supplies imported from the United States and the British Empire. The Japanese jingoes, however, were enraged.

At the same time the United States proceeded to flaunt the new pact. The State Department directed its consular officials in China to advise all Americans to return to America at the earliest moment. Even more to the point, the press was permitted to announce without contradiction that the "U. S. Navy Prepares to Use Hongkong." It was revealed that a large shipment of intake valves essential to the operation and repair of American submarines had been stored in that port. The *New York Times* correspondent, Hallett Abend, cabled his paper that the storing of these valves was "indicative of long-laid plans

for possible American-British co-operation in the Far Eastern Waters." From Washington Jesse H. Jones, Federal Loan Administrator, after conferring with T. V. Soong, President of the Bank of China, announced his eagerness to help the Japanese-harried nation in any way possible.

The purport of these moves was not lost on the Japanese. Faced by a united front of British and American imperialism, the Japanese jingoes beat a hasty diplomatic retreat. This retreat, however, was only tactical. The Japanese can only postpone, they cannot avoid a final showdown with their rivals.

EXPAND OR BURST!

Japan now finds herself even in a more critical position than Hitler in September, 1939, when, confronted with the necessity of either expanding or bursting, he launched the Second World Imperialist War by marching into Poland.

Today it is British-American imperialism on the one hand and the Soviet Union on the other who bar the road to Japanese expansion. Both forces, fully realizing the consequences of a Japanese victory in China, have encouraged Chinese resistance to the limit by supplying the necessary war material with which to meet the invaders. After three years of invasion, Japan finds herself today bled white and the position of the Chungking regime stronger than ever before. The campaign in China has bogged down and not only has Japan lost "face," but the internal position of Japanese imperialism has been dangerously weakened until it is now face to face with the danger of collapse and ignominious defeat.

The Island Empire, it has been correctly observed, is the poorest of the six great powers in resources, and the most exposed to crippling by embargo and boycott. The present war, by cutting off European sources of supply, has made Japan dependent on the United States and the dependencies of Great Britain for essential materials of war. Since the summer of 1940 there has been an effective and growing embargo of these war materials directed against Japan. Already two of the most essential raw materials of war which Japan must import, machinery and machine tools, and iron and scrap steel, have been cut off by the U. S. embargo.

Also included in the list of embargoed war materials is aviation gas and high octane gas. Japan is also dependent upon the United States and British possessions for copper, lead, nickel, zinc, tin, aluminum, ore, manganese, mica and cotton. There are, however, some alternative sources of supply open to the Japanese. The Netherlands Indies, easily accessible, are capable of supplying all of the oil, aluminum, tin, and manganese that Japan requires. These Dutch islands are in a poor position to offer effective resistance and could be seized easily by the Japanese. But that would mean immediate war, since the Netherlands Indies are now under the direct protection of Great Britain, and Secretary of State Hull has publicly announced that the United States government will not countenance any change in their sovereignty. In its presently exposed position, with the unfriendly Soviet poised on its Western flank, Japan can ill afford to risk war unless driven by desperate necessity.

For the time being therefore, Japan is contenting herself with exerting pressure on the Netherlands Indies government to force a "voluntary" trade agreement. Thus far Japan has succeeded in extorting a commitment for an oil supply covering 40% of its non-aviation gas requirements for the next six months. Increased pressure is being brought to bear for further concessions. According to the press this limited agreement was made with the approval of London and Washington. It is stated that the western powers have no intention of supplying Japan with an excuse to attack the Dutch Indies. They recognize that any attempt to place a total oil embargo against Japan would undoubtedly force the Japanese to take drastic action.

JAPAN MUST FIGHT

On the other hand the Japanese have no intention of allowing themselves to be gradually strangled. Rather than be "peacefully" squeezed into impotence, they will cast the fat into the fire and extend the Second World War into the theatre of the Far East. To prepare for the eventual necessity of war, the Japanese are feverishly attempting to woo Stalin for a "Non-Aggression" Pact with the U. S. S. R. which will assure the benevolent neutrality of Stalin in the Far East as well as in Western Europe. However, there is small likelihood that such an agreement

can be concluded. Stalin has proved himself an adept at power politics and it would be the height of political folly for Stalin to pull Japan's chestnuts out of the fire. A weakened and defeated Japan would far better serve the interests of Stalin and Co. Moreover, Stalin has had a rude awakening over the Nazi-Soviet Pact, which he entered into in the expectation that British and Nazi imperialisms would exhaust each other in a hopeless stalemate, with Stalin alone profiting.

Whether or not the Japanese can win a rapprochement with the Soviet, the desperation of their plight makes a resort to war on their part inevitable. Once such a war breaks out in the Far East, United States imperialism must automatically become involved; as Ambassador Grew has pointed out and as Robert Aura Smith has so graphically shown in "Our Future in Asia," American imperialism's interests in the Far East are far from being sentimental.

U. S. IMPERIALISM UNMASKED

The fact that German imperialism has adopted the brutal totalitarian political pattern of Fascism has greatly facilitated the task of British imperialism and its American ally in picturing the Second World Imperialist War as a holy crusade against Fascism, totally obscuring the basic and irreconcilable economic rivalry which is the true cause of the raging carnage. Although today the representatives of American imperialism brazenly proclaim that the interests of the United States in the Far East are not limited to sentimental considerations, such is their hypocrisy that if on the morrow the United States were to find itself engaged in waging war against Japanese imperialism, we would be solemnly assured that this new struggle was part and parcel of the holy crusade against Fascism.

Forgotten would be all talk and declarations in favor of the "Open Door" policy, with equal rights to all to trade with and exploit China. Overnight, the battle for the control of China and the Far East would have been converted into a "glorious battle to save democracy and destroy Fascism." The coming war in the Far East is but another portion of the huge and mounting cost that the American working class must pay for their social and political backwardness in permitting the ruling class to perpetuate its system of capitalist exploitation and growing Fascist enslavement.